

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 13, 2007, claims 16-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyazaki, and claims 1, 3-10, 12-15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable given Miyazaki in view of Lin. Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to thank Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the conference call of April 17, 2007. During that call, Applicant's representative and Examiner discussed both the Miyazaki and the Lin references. Applicant's representative mentioned that Miyazaki taught computing devices having only a single threshold voltage, contrary to the claimed "computing devices having one of a plurality of threshold voltages." As understood by Applicant's representative, Examiner noted that the limitation of "computing devices having one of a plurality of threshold voltages" was being interpreted to require "at least one threshold voltage." That is, while different ones of a plurality of threshold voltages may be possible per this limitation, Examiner was interpreting it in such a manner that the limitation was met by teachings of one or more threshold voltages. Furthermore, with regard to the Lin reference, Applicant's representative noted that the teachings of Lin cited as reading on the claimed different threshold voltages (i.e., Lin's TCD and TFD) in fact concerned different time delay values, not different threshold voltages. In response, as understood by Applicant's representative, Examiner asserted that it is known in the art that such different delays in computing devices are the result of different threshold voltages.

In light of this, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 16, 20 and 24 to more specifically recite that the plurality of computing devices have different ones of a plurality of threshold voltages, i.e., that the processing device employs more than one threshold voltage by virtue of the plurality of computing devices. Applicants submit that these amendments do not add new

subject matter to the instant disclosure. (It is further noted that claim 21 has been canceled above in favor of now-amended claim 20, and that claim 22 has been amended to recite the proper dependency.) Applicants again note that Miyazaki fails to teach multiple threshold voltage devices and therefore fails to anticipate each and every limitation of claims 16-23, and also fails to establish prima facie obviousness of claims 1, 3-10, 12-15 and 24.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 1, 3-10, 12-15 and 24, Applicants re-assert their argument that Lin fails to teach a processing device having multiple computing devices each having different ones of a plurality of threshold voltages and, as such, fails to establish prima facie obviousness. Examiner's assertion that different timing delays are the result of different threshold voltages appears to be a statement of knowledge alleged to be well-known in the art. Assuming this to be the case, Applicants traverse such statement of well-known knowledge to the extent that the time delays taught by Lin may, in fact, be derived in any of a number of ways known to those of skill in the art and are not necessarily the result of different threshold voltages, as presently claimed. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03(C), Applicants respectfully request that Examiner provide documentary evidence in support of his position.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/14/07

By: 
Christopher P. Moreno
Registration No. 38,566

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7842
fax: (312) 609-5005